

## REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending. Claims 1, 12, 14 and 17 are amended. Claims 13 and 18 are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the underlying subject matter. Claims 21-24 are new. No new matter is introduced.

The present amendment accompanies the RCE filed herewith under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114. Prior to continued examination of the subject application, Applicants respectfully request entry of this amendment. Reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

The Office Action rejects under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) claims 1-20 as being anticipated by Koseki et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,732,124 (hereinafter “*Koseki*”).

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 Fed. Cir. 1987).

Applicants submit that *Koseki* does not expressly or inherently describe each and every element of the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Koseki* does not disclose or suggest, at least,

releasing control of the log entry to the consumer, so that execution of the event can resume, prior to writing the log entry information to the log file, wherein releasing control of the log entry to the consumer comprises:

cloning the log entry, wherein the log entry clone is a copy of an entire log entry that comprises the log entry information,

as recited, among other features, in independent claims 1 and 12 (emphasis added).

The Office Action at page 8, paragraph 2, states that *Koseki*, col. 10, lines 36-58, teaches the features of “releasing control...prior to writing the log entry information to the log file.” According to the Office Action, in this section, *Koseki* discloses “setting the specified metadata control block to be [in] the ‘in use’ or ‘free’ state.” Setting a metadata control block to be in the “in use” or “free” state does not disclose or suggest the claimed “releasing control.” Moreover, there is no disclosure or suggestion that the metadata control block is so set prior to writing the log entry information to the log file. Therefore, *Koseki* does not disclose or suggest “releasing control...prior to writing the log entry information to the log file,” as claimed. Moreover, citing a separate section of *Koseki* (col. 28, lines 15-18), the Office Action at page 8, paragraph 3, states that *Koseki* discloses “cloning the log entry...,” as further recited in claim 1. Even if this cited section of *Koseki* discloses “cloning

a log entry,” which it does not, *Koseki* does not disclose or suggest cloning a log entry as part of releasing control of the log entry to the consumer. Therefore, *Koseki* does not disclose or suggest “wherein releasing control of the log entry to the consumer comprises: cloning the log entry, wherein the log entry clone is a copy of an entire log entry that comprises the log entry information,” as claimed. The sections of *Koseki*, cited in the Office Action, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in independent claims 1 and 12. Therefore, independent claims 1 and 12 are in condition for allowance over the applied reference for at least these reasons.

With respect to independent claim 17, Applicants submit that the applied art does not disclose or suggest a multiple-threaded log manager, wherein the log manager, independently and separately from other processes, logs events, by:

releasing control of the log entry to the consumer, so that execution of the event can resume, prior to writing the log entry information to the log file, wherein releasing control of the log entry to the consumer comprises: the log manager cloning the log entry, wherein the log entry clone is a copy of the log entry that comprises the log entry information,

as recited, among other features, in independent claim 17. As described above, *Koseki* does not disclose or suggest at least these features of independent claim 17. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 17 is in condition for allowance over the applied art.

Claims 2-11 depend from independent claim 1, claims 14-16 depend from independent claim 12, and claims 19-20 depend from independent claim 17. Therefore, claims 2-11, 14-16 and 19-20 are allowable for the reasons stated above and for the additional features recited therein.

Applicants have added new claims 21-24 and submit that these claims are in condition for allowance over the applied art.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicants believe that the rejection against this application has been fully addressed and that the application is now in condition for allowance. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection and a notice of allowance for the application are respectfully requested.

It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such

extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to deposit account no. 50-1078.

If the Examiner believes that a personal or telephonic interview would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange for such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 15, 2005

Sean S. Wooden, Reg. No. 43,997  
**ANDREWS KURTH LLP**  
1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Telephone: (202) 662-2700  
Fax: (202) 662-2739